IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

IN RE:	
SPECTRULITE CONSORTIUM, INC.,	Bankruptcy Case No. 03-30329
Debtor.)
CHARLES W. RISKE, Liquidating Trustee,))
Plaintiff,))
VS.	Adversary Case No. 09-3190
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY,))
Defendant.))

OPINION

This matter having come before the Court on Defendant The Dow Chemical Company's Motion to Dismiss Count III and Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant The Dow Chemical Company's Motion to Dismiss Count III; the Court, having reviewed written memoranda of the parties and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Rule 7052 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

In its Motion to Dismiss, Defendant The Dow Chemical Company asserts that the Plaintiff's claim for unjust enrichment, found in Count III of the Complaint, is foreclosed as a result of the Plaintiff's legal duty to clean up waste on a contaminated site owned by Spectrulite Consortium, Inc. In support of this proposition, Defendant cites In re Energy Coop, Inc., 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7545, and also Ford Motor Co.

Case 09-03190-lkg Doc 24 Filed 12/01/09 Page 2 of 2

v. Edgewood Props., Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84776. Defendant The Dow

Chemical Company also cites § 106 of the Restatement of Restitution as explained in

Griffith Wrecking Co. v. Greminger, 382 N.E.2d 1387 (4th Dist. III. App. Ct. 1978).

The Court has reviewed the authority cited by the Defendant and finds it

persuasive. In applying the authority cited to the instant case, the Court finds that

the Plaintiff's own allegations in its Complaint preclude any claim for unjust

enrichment. However, the Plaintiff is free to pursue the relief sought in Counts I and

II of its Complaint.

ENTERED: December 1, 2009.

/s/Gerald D. Fines

GERALD D. FINES

United States Bankruptcy Judge